



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/164,624	10/01/1998	YOSHIHIRO ISHIDA	35.C-13000	6892

5514 7590 04/23/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

YE, LIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	14

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/164,624

Applicant(s)

ISHIDA ET AL

Examiner

Lin Ye

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 24-36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 24 and 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

For amended claims 24 and 31 filed on 2/10/03, they raise the issue of new matter, because those claims amended to “..a reception unit adapted to receive information of **at least one of a size of an object and a distance to the object** for detecting a desired object, from an external apparatus...”. This would request the reception unit receive information from an external apparatus to meet following two conditions: (1) the received information includes a size of an object **or** a distance to the object; (2) received information includes a size of an object **and** a distance to the object. However, the applicant’s specification only states the reception unit receive the size of a moving object to be detected from an external apparatus, and it does not states the reception unit receive the both the size of object and the distance to object from the external apparatus (See Page 20, lines 15-21, Page 21, lines 11-16 and Figure 18).

For art rejection purpose, the examiner only consider the claims have one condition as the reception unit receive information includes a size of an object from an external apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 24-25, 28-29, 31-32 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ito et al. U.S. Patent 6,108,033.

Referring to claim 24, Ito reference discloses in Figures 3-4, 8 and 14, an image processing apparatus comprises an input unit (1101) adapted to input image data (See Col. 5, lines 56-59); a template registration step 14 as shown in Figure 4, the template image size is defined as $ft(x,y)$ in image memory 1103 accordance with a program memory 1106 (See Col 5, lines 60-65 and Col. 6, lines 63-67), so it can be considered as a reception unit (image memory 1103) adapted to receive information a size of an object, for detecting a desired object, from an external apparatus (program memory 1106); a detection unit (CPU 1104) adapted to detect the object corresponding to the information received by said reception unit, from the image data (See Col 6, lines 20-21); and a transmission unit (output I/F 1108)

adapted to transmit a detection result of the object to the external apparatus (alarm lamp 1110) when said detection unit detects the object.

Referring to claim 25, Ito reference discloses wherein said input unit (TV camera 1101) comprises an image pickup unit adapted to pick up the object image through an optical system as shown in Figure 15A (See Col. 14, lines 8-12).

Referring to claim 28, Ito reference discloses wherein said detection unit (CPU 1104) detects the object according to a difference value between pictures (between template image and new image, see Figure 4, steps 14-16).

Referring to claim 29, Ito reference discloses wherein said detection unit (1104) binarizes the difference value by using a predetermined threshold and detects the object according to a binarization result (See Col. 7, lines 64-67).

Referring to claim 31, Ito reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respect to same comment as with claim 24.

Referring to claim 32, Ito reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respect to same comment as with claim 25.

Referring to claim 35, Ito reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respect to same comment as with claim 28.

Referring to claim 36, Ito reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respect to same comment as with claim 29.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 26, 27, 30, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. U.S. Patent 6,108,033 in view of Salvati U.S. Patent 6,359,644.

Referring to claim 26, the Ito reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respect to claim 25, but except Ito does not state the TV camera system can use focusing control information to measure the distance from the object to the predetermined position instead of magnification factor.

Salvati reference discloses in Figure 2, a video camera (10) comprises a lens system having selected optical characteristics and a CCD imager. The system includes a microprocessor/CPU that calculates the size of the target object by mathematically manipulating the optical characteristics, the focus data, the zoom data, and pixel data. The exact object distance is determined by feedback from the focus motor and calculating the deviation from zero. (See Col. 5, lines 25-30). This would be an advantage over Ito's TV camera system in that it could achieve to change an object image into a distance image for the purpose of recognizing objects and get more accurate distance result, as taught by Salvati. For that reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see the TV camera can associate the focusing control information for measuring the distance from the detected object to the predetermined position disclosed by Ito.

Referring to claim 27, the Ito reference discloses wherein the image pickup unit (1101) comprises a zoom control unit adapted to control zooming of the optical system, and said detection unit (CPU 1104) detects the object according to zoom control information generated by the zoom control unit (See Col. 14, lines 56-67).

Referring to claim 30, the Ito reference discloses wherein said image processing apparatus is used in a monitoring camera system (TV camera, See Col. 5, lines 41-50).

Referring to claim 33, Ito reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respect to same comment as with claim 26.

Referring to claim 34, Ito reference discloses all subject matter as discussed with respect to same comment as with claim 27.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lin Ye whose telephone number is (703) 305-3250. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy R Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.



NGOC-YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Lin Ye
April 21, 2003